DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 196 SP 006 989

AUTHOR	Rinehart, Alice Duffy
TITLE	Review of Research Related to Graduate School Teacher Intern Programs.
PUB DATE	[70]
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Inservice Teacher Education; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Student Teachers; *Teacher Interns

ABSTRACT

This document organizes reports concerning teacher intern programs and participants into two parts: explanatory and evaluative. Reports reviewed in the first part define distinguishing features of the intern pattern of teacher preparation, its status, and its historic development. The second part contains reports of research about the effectiveness of interns as teachers and the evaluation of the interns' problems and strengths, with implications for improving intern programs for the professional preparation of teachers. (Author)

ED 083196

by Alice Duffy Rinehart

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

REVIEW OF RESEARCH RELATED TO GRADUATE SCHOOL TEACHER INTERN PROGRAMS

This review is written as a guide to those who would learn about the history of teacher intern programs and seek evidence about the effectiveness of such programs for teacher preparation. It will examine selected reports and research concerned with the teacher intern pattern for preparation of students for elementary and secondary school teaching, and will be confined to studies of graduate school programs, including what are commonly known as MAT programs. This type of initial preparation of teachers, through a supervised internship in conjunction with course work at a graduate school, is a twentieth century development and as yet prepares only a small but growing proportion of the country's beginning teachers. Since it is a relatively new departure, the theory of teacher intern programs and the success of their products need to be examined critically; man's tendency, especially in regard to public schooling, to fear the innovative or to rush into any promising change may result either in skepticism and rigidity or in a rash of unevaluated activities. Therefore, in comparing the intern pattern to the traditional, undergraduate student-teacher channel of professional preparation, we need to know why and how this alternate pattern has developed and whether there is any objective evidence of the superiority of one pattern over another.

The importance of researched information about intern programs, their practices, products, and effectiveness becomes more apparent with

SP 006 989

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the recognition of numerous social, economic, and ideological forces at work in the decade of the '70's which are likely to attract a larger proportion of would-be teachers to the post-college, paid internship style of professional preparation. Among these forces are the growing number of admissions to liberal arts colleges which do not claim to provide vocational training, the technological era exploding with new knowledge to be mastered, a period of affluence along with college youth's incongruous reaction of alienation from materialism as they choose a life-style of self-expression and service to the reform of society's ills (including the schools), a growing interest in adult education, career flexibility, and employment for women whose children have reached school age.

The studies reviewed herein were selected as important examples of the different kinds of analyses and fact-finding being done about interns and the intern pattern of teacher preparation. The review is organized into two categories, the explanatory and the evaluative. Although not all of the studies can clearly be placed exclusively in one group or the other, in general those included in Part I are sources which provide answers to such questions as what is distinctive about the intern-style of preparation? how extensive is it? and why has it developed historically as an alternative to the traditional, undergraduate program of preparation? Part II is a survey of recent research that seeks to evaluate the effectiveness of interns as teachers and of the programs as the means of preparation. The second part includes efforts to compare intern teachers to traditionally trained teachers and to identify the distinguishing characteristics of interns, if any, - their problems, needs, strengths, weaknesses, and the sources of these.

Part I: Definition, Extent, and History

Definition

To gain an understanding of the distinguishing differences between student teaching and teacher internship one would do well to start with Michaelis' clear definition in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research and then turn to the most complete single source of information on internships in teacher education, the Forty-Seventh Yearbook of the Association for Student Teaching (1968). Michaelis compares student-teacher programs and intern programs in regard to admission criteria and patterns of course work and teaching experience. In the AST Yearbook a single definition of internship is used as a point of departure for a dozen different authors to discuss historic development, theory, purposes, processes, and components of intern programs. The Yearbook contains an excellent, annotated bibliography, unequalled as a guide to the research and essays on internships in teacher education.

Extent

Because of methodological limitations and inconsistencies in gathering data over the past twenty years information is incomplete about the number of intern programs, the number of participants, growth of programs, and specific differences in admission qualifications, program requirements, and organization. These limitations have stemmed from the use of questionnaires to differing populations, poor percentage of returns, and lack of definition of precisely what was to be classified as an internship. Therefore, it is dangerous to make comparisons of findings from several periodic studies with the thought that one is getting a

true picture of growth or a complete picture of extent. Nonetheless, with this warning in mind, the following are worth examining for a chronology of changes: the surveys by Stevens (1956), Shaplin and Powell (1964, citing Ruker's survey in 1952), Harap (1967), Johnson (1968), and Schloerke and Czajkowski (1968). In 1956 Stevens reported 45 intern programs involving 3,394 interns among the 681 teacher education institutions which replied. The numbers of interns preparing for elementary teaching and for secondary were almost equal. His figures include numerous undergraduates whose practice experience was labeled an internship. Johnson's total of 192 programs in 1968 (mostly graduate MAT) should be used with caution, inasmuch as it is difficult to identify what data in his report pertain to internships, whether respondents to his questionnaire used the same definition, whether he has distinguished between graduate programs and undergraduate programs. Probably most meaningful, though incomplete because limited to the institutions belonging to AACTE, is the internship survey made in 1967 by Schloerke and Czajkowski. Of the 733 institutions, 48 indicated they operated graduate level intern programs, of which 20 were preparing elementary teachers and 28 secondary, enrolling 347 and 1,195 interns respectively. Thus, interns represent a very small fraction of the two million teachers in our public schools.

History

Several very worthwhile studies have been written describing and interpreting the historic development of the internship style of teacher preparation; each author has related the historic unfolding to

changes in the economy or in the society at large or to changes in ideologies about education. Among others, Borrowman (1965), Conant (1963), Curti (1935), and Woodring (1957) have written extensive analyses of the pragmatic forces for change in teacher education which are contextual, that is, changes which are reactive to and emergent from the social and economic context and from the educational leadership of the times.

A similar analysis but bearing specifically on the intern pattern of teacher preparation is found in a thorough history of teacher training through internship by Shaplin and Powell (1964), in which they associated the development and adaptations of internship with changing educational ideas and economic conditions ever since the first effort by Brown University in 1895. This part of the study alone would make it valuable, but they also made a unique contribution at the time by describing differences among various intern programs of the past and present in regard to time requirements, practicum and course sequences, and final objectives (i.e. certification or master's degree). Gardner's (1968) chapter on "The Teacher Education Internship in Historical Perspective" seems to have been adapted from Shaplin's and Powell's interpretation.

Butterweck (1955) developed an original theme that changes in student population and in the scope of school obligations caused teacher education to turn its emphasis consecutively to various social sciences for knowledge about learning processes, psychological testing, relevant curriculum, emotional and mental hygiene, social psychology, and most recently anthropology. Butterweck saw the necessity to provide future teachers with a longer preparation and more experience in life

in order to develop understanding of the growing number of pertinent social sciences. To accomplish that, he sees the need for graduate level teacher training with internship following a broad undergraduate education.

The short, customary student teaching experience is considered no longer adequate also by Gardner and Henry (1968), as our complex and advanced technological society puts greater demands upon teacher-competence and upon the educators of teachers. Among the more complex skills demanded they specify more competence in decision-making, analysis of the professional situation, diagnosis of the learning potential of students, provision of instructional programs appropriate to individuals, and flexibility in new and different teaching situations, in relationships, and in utilization of a growing variety of technological devices. Indeed, while one may wonder whether such an ideal model can be realized through any program for teacher training, one can recognize that the development of these competencies requires more time, more maturity, more education and broad experience than a teacher candidate usually acquires as an undergraduate. Thus the intern pattern is proposed as a feasible route into teaching for persons who have had time for a greater variety of experiences since graduation, including jobs, peace corps, child rearing, military service. In sum, Gardner and Henry (p. 183) conclude: "Perhaps much of the reported success of these (intern) programs is due to the selective quality of the individuals who enroll, rather than to the attributes of the programs themselves."

In addition to pragmatic forces for change in reaction to the times, another contextual pressure for change is intellectual and

ideological, stemming from discontent and aspiration within the profession itself. This is seen in the vast amount of educational research and discourse of ideas which fill the professional magazines in efforts from inside the profession to identify and improve teacher effectiveness. "In the current season of turbulence in the ideological order...leaders must understand that demands for change which stem from ideological turbulence are much more than the usual calls for perennial adjustment of institutional processes. This demand for change is a challenge to the very purposes of institutions" (Stoops, 1968, p. 147).

Part II: Evaluation of Effectiveness

Theory

Evaluation of the effectiveness of intern programs and their products is hampered by lack of a theory or framework of criteria, principles, objectives, and proposed methods for achieving objectives. Although much has been written about the primary importance of supervised experience or practice in teaching as a component in any teacher training program (see Ballantine, et al.,1966; Broudy, 1965; Brown and Brown, 1968; Goodlad, 1965; Hazard, et al., 1967; Shaplin, 1961), there is some concern about the lack of attention to internship theory during the growth of these programs (see Brown, 1966; Gardner and Henry, 1968; Moore, 1967; Rex, 1961, 1968; Ward, 1968).

Brown (1966) is critical of the fact that most research on teacher effectiveness is done within the tradition of psychology, unfortunately divorcing theory from practice by evaluating behavior without questioning or defining the theory which established the criteria for judging effectiveness, without clarifying the paradigm

against which the practice is to be rated. (See also Denemark and MacDonald, 1967, p. 241.) Rex (1961, 1968) argues that a theoretical framework is essential in any profession before adequate training methods, evaluation, and research will be possible, and that since there is no clear definition of the theory of internship there can be no substantial body of experimental evidence supporting or refuting the worth of the internship. He proposes a conceptual model which he believes would permit experimental research on effectiveness of interns.

Fully one-third of the AST Yearbook (1968), referred to earlier, is devoted to a discussion of internship theory, in which see Blackmore, Gardner, Hoffman, Rex, and Ward. And brief reference to theoretical rationale for their intern programs may be found in the Johns Hopkins University (n.d.) and Indiana University (1969) bulletins. A study by Stone and Robinson (1965) of the secondary intern program at the University of California at Berkeley is unusual in that it is the only critical self-examination this reviewer could locate that defines the effect of the program's theoretical model upon development of its specific curriculum.

Effectiveness: Programs and Participants

In studying and evaluating teacher intern programs the ultimate question is concerned with the effectiveness of the interns as teachers; it is through their teaching success that the quality of the program of preparation is judged. Thus research seeks to identify any distinguishing characteristics of interns (their strengths, weaknesses, needs) and hopefully to identify the source of these, be it in the inherent qualifications of the participants or in the curriculum and

methods of the program itself.

The myriad of problems in judging teacher effectiveness (comprehensively examined in two reviews of research by Biddle and Ellena, 1964, and by Denemark and MacDonald, 1967) apply equally to evaluating teaching interns. The great mass of research on teacher effectiveness leads to one uncontested conclusion: no comprehensive criterion of teacher effectiveness, no single or identifiable combination of personal, academic, or professional qualities in the teacher either at the time of admission to teacher training or upon graduation, and no particular factor or technique in the training program has consistently correlated with teacher effectiveness. Nonetheless, countless investigations still go on in the search to find out what makes the difference.

In regard to interns this effort is seen in reports and research issuing from universities where intern programs are operating. These studies have concentrated on three areas: the effect of specific components in the program itself, comparisons of interns with traditionally trained teachers, and the identification of distinguishing characteristics, behaviors, strengths, weaknesses, and needs of interns *per se*.

Components in the Training Program. Differences in teaching ability thought to stem from factors in the training of interns were examined by Allen (1966) and by Hite (1968). Allen reported growing research evidence in Stanford University's intern program that specific training sequences change the performance of intern teachers, namely in such skills as "set induction", multiple frames of reference, and closure. He describes advantages of other techniques for training

such as micro-teaching, time-lapse photography, video observation, and teacher ratings. Also he explains the organizational plan for released time for public school staff to supervise and share in the instruction of interns. Certain facets of their program have been evaluated through research.

The research by Hite (1968) on effective ways of training interns was different in that he used the experimental mode, manipulating factors in the preparation of elementary interns in order to investigate the impact of different training experiences upon rated teaching success. Ratings were made among the differently trained groups half way through the first year of teaching and again at the end of the year to see if differences persisted. One hundred and twenty interns at Washington State University were divided into three experimental groups and one control group. The treatment variable for each of the three was either released time from intern teaching for classroom preparation, time for observation, or reduced pupil load. Hite's study reported no statistically significant differences attributable to any single criterion among the three experimental groups. However, the findings in the first study showed 25 per cent higher scores on teaching performance in all three experimental groups than in the control group. The group receiving the highest mean overall score was clearly that to whom 25 per cent fewer pupils had been assigned; those assigned to observation ranked second. The follow-up study showed that differences among the four treatment groups tended to become smaller, though they maintained their relative rank one to another. The control group, which had been rated markedly inferior

at the mid-year rating, made the greatest gain, which may be an illustration of the regression tendency.

Comparison with Non-Intern Teachers. Comparison of the teaching effectiveness of interns with that of traditionally trained teachers was the primary purpose of research about interns prior to the present decade, at a time when intern programs were more suspect. Findings from thse comparative studies have been contradictory and the means of measuring teacher success have been questionable in reliability and objectivity. Halliwell (1964) in his valuable review of all such research up to 1964 has criticized the research designs of most of these studies and concluded that their findings did not provide evidence of the superiority of one form of preparation over another. The same can be said about the post-1964 research which compares products of the two types of programs.

Among recent studies those of Sorber (1964) and of Wieder (1967) compared interns' verbal patterns of interaction with patterns of student teachers, using Flander's Interaction Analysis. With minor differences in design of the studies, both reported statistically significant differences which showed that the student teachers had more indirect and "integrative" relationship with pupils and made less use of lectures and direct learning than did the interns.

Kershner (1968) and Arends (1969) recently reported comparative studies of graduates of intern programs and of undergraduate programs on the same campuses, in search of evidence of differences in competency between the two groups. Whereas both used similar designs, applying statistical tests of significance and gathering data by means of teacher-rating scales and standardized achievement tests of pupils, there is

contradiction in the findings of the two studies. Using trained, university supervisors' ratings of competency of first-year teachers, Kershner concluded that "interns demonstrated greater general competency than conventional student teachers," while Arends, studying elementary teachers and using principals' ratings, reported no significant differences between the two groups on any of the eighteen competencies, and no significant difference in pupil change as measured by standardized achievement tests. Both Kershner and Arends also sought feedback from students on their perceived strengths and weaknesses and the source of these, in an effort to learn how the students judged the impact of their training programs. Both studies found that student teachers and interns alike identified the first source of their strengths as intrinsic within themselves, i.e. not attributable to the teacher-education program. Both interns and student teachers in Arend's study indicated the second source of strength was field experience. Both of these findings on the source of strengths as perceived by interns are consistent with findings in the Rinehart (1969) study. Arends found that a significantly higher per cent of interns than student teachers expressed satisfaction with their training and that employment stability was statistically more significant for interns but that there was no significant difference in relation to type of public school.

Wulk and Miller (1965) reported qualifications and characteristics of 28 secondary interns compared to 272 secondary student teachers at U.C.L.A., in addition to describing the sequence of their program. These interns were reported to have a higher grade point average, to be more traveled, to have more former experience as teachers and youth leaders, and to hold more scholastic honors. Cooperating teachers in the public schools were favorably impressed

by the greater enthusiasm, initiative, and drive of the interns compared to student teachers they had supervised.

Characteristics of Interns. In the past six years as the intern pattern of teacher preparation comes of age there has begun to appear more research about interns per se, in addition to the type of studies reviewed above comparing participants of the two styles of programs. Studies by Stone and Robinson (1965), Hill and Medley (1968), Haberman (1956), Bulazo (1965), Ryan (1966), Livingston (1962), Moss (1968), Miller (1970), and Rinehart (1969) add insights into the special qualifications, characteristics, behavior, problems, and satisfactions of interns as beginning teachers.

In Stone and Robinson's (1965) six-year report on the intern program of the University of California at Berkeley one finds interesting details of personal data about the interns' qualifications at time of admission (age, marital status, previous full-time employment, previous experience with youth groups, undergraduate colleges, majors, and grade averages). Their report includes a follow-up study of Berkeley interns from the first six years of that program, showing their employment record as teachers (placement, employment stability, ratings). No attempt was made to compare interns with regularly trained teachers but it is evident from the data that they have above-average qualifications and records.

Hill and Medley (1968) examined the impact of supervision and the internship upon teaching behavior. By means of interaction Analysis scales and Medley's Observation Schedule and Record they measured "Change in Behaviors of First Year Interns." Using a sample of 110 interns, 40 elementary and 70 secondary, they reported significant

differences between February and May on fourteen Interaction Analysis scales and on 15 items in Medley's Observation Schedule and Record. These differences indicated that the interns during their internship had learned to use more divergent questions, were being less evaluative and more neutral in their responses to pupils, and were shifting from direct question-and-response to student-initiated responses.

Haberman (1965), through the use of observations, reading-score gains by pupils, and interaction-analysis ratios, reported factors which discriminate between successful and unsuccessful interns. He identified several factors not on the usual check-lists for rating teachers, factors which he concluded may be special strengths of interns. These were the interns' enthusiasm for a subject, hobby, or art form; the intern's ability to organize groups and manage situations as evidenced in their undergraduate leadership; and their willingness to listen.

Several researchers have sought to identify the teaching problems of beginning interns for two purposes: (1) to learn more about the nature of the interns, their distinctive strengths and needs, and (2) to use this information to improve the related components in the intern training program. The last pieces of research to be included in this review all bear upon this search to know the interns--their problems, their assets, and their evaluations of the particular intern program by which they were trained.

Bulazo, Ryan, Livingston, Miller, Moss, and Rinehart all looked at initial teaching experiences as the testing ground for effectiveness both of interns and of their professional programs. The first three studies used the opinions of different combinations of supervisors,

interns, and third-party observors to identify initial teaching problems, whereas Miller, Moss, and Rinehart sought the opinions of interns only. In addition to perceived problems the last three studies included interns' perceptions of their own strengths and sources of satisfaction as teachers. As will be reported below, Moss and Rinehart went beyond self-perceived problems and strengths to seek the interns' evaluations of the strengths and weakness of the entire intern program of professional preparation which they had experienced.

Bulazo (1965) identified interns' initial teaching problems by investigating the areas where supervision was most frequently given. On a list of possible areas of supervision, interns and their college supervisors indicated supervision was most often concerned with human relations (including discipline), decision-making, and counseling and self-analysis. He also looked for possible effect of personality compatibility between supervisor and intern teacher, as measured by the Manifold Interest Schedule. His reported findings were complex and, to this reviewer, questionable because of the instrument used to measure compatibility and because of his basic assumption that greater compatibility is evidenced by a greater amount of supervisory assistance.

Ryan (1966) investigated initial problems encountered by secondary teaching interns. Using interviews, case studies, observations, and questionnaires to gather his data, he came to the conclusion that many of their problems stem from a sociological gap between interns and their public-school pupils. He conjectured that there are socio-economic reasons that this gap would be greater with interns than with regularly trained teachers. Beecher (as cited by Halliwell, 1964) and Shaplin and Powell (1964) have also reported evidence that interns come

from a higher socio-economic background than do student teachers. On the basis of his findings Ryan recommended changes in the training program to develop sociological awareness.

Livingston (1962) submitted a questionnaire to sixty secondary interns and about an equal number of their school and university supervisors and their university subject-matter supervisors in order to identify, describe, and analyze the professional problems of secondary intern teachers. His findings showed that each of his four groups of respondents, holding different roles in the intern program, saw somewhat different areas of concern according to their own roles and frames of judgment on teaching objectives. Livingston's interns reported their greatest problems in the following descending order of frequency: (1) organization of time, (2) how to teach the subject, (3) "the self," (4) situational characteristics. For his entire, four-sided sample the order of problems clustered in these categories: (1) teaching the subject, (2) relationships to students, including discipline, (3) equipment, supplies, and facilities, (4) relationships to adults, (5) status as interns. Livingston concluded from his findings that intern's problems are not substantially different from those of all beginning teachers.

Similar to part of Livingston's study but more sophisticated in analysis is Miller's (1970) investigation of interns' perceptions of their beginning teaching experiences (the internship). The purpose of his study was to seek information upon which to base recommendations for improvements in the intern program at Temple University. He used a questionnaire to gather his data from 90 secondary interns, asking them to identify sources of "pressure, difficulty, and satisfaction"

during the first year of teaching. Analysis was made for each selected component with respect to effect of the (1) year interns began teaching (1965 or 1967), (2) sex of interns, (3) school level taught (junior or senior high), (4) racial composition of pupils taught, and (5) time of year questionnaire was completed. Rank order coefficients were calculated between variables of frequency, intensity, and consistency over time. Interns ranked pressure of planning as the greatest source of pressure, student behavior as the greatest source of difficulty, and the opportunity to learn constantly about teaching as their greatest satisfaction. Two perhaps unexpected findings reported were (1) that none of the pressure, difficulty, or satisfaction was attributed to the racial composition of pupils taught, and (2) that observations by supervisors, pressure from administrators, and pressure from parents were not associated with pressure or difficulty.

Moss (1968) sought the reaction of interns to the value of the internship by submitting a reactionnaire to 86 interns in six colleges and universities, both graduate and undergraduate, elementary and secondary interns. He reported his findings separately for the graduate students, but unfortunately did not distinguish between perceptions by elementary interns and those by secondary, whose needs, programs, and experiences may be different. Moss asked the students to indicate advantages of the internship over student teaching, weakness of the internship experience, willingness to choose internship again, and highlights of the internship experience. He reported that the graduate interns felt that the major advantages of the internship over practice teaching (which they had not experienced) were (a) increased experience offered by the longer teaching time, (b) increased responsibility for

the classroom, (c) financial renumeration, (d) channel for liberal arts graduates to enter teaching, (e) opportunity to see children mature and grow. Disadvantages and program weakness were (a) too little intensive pre-internship preparation in methods and organization, (b) inadequate orientation to the public school and faculty, and (c) the burden of concurrent course work while teaching.

The study by Rinehart (1969) examined intern perceptions of all aspects of the intern program, not just the initial teaching experience. Five major areas for evaluation were explored: most and least effective experiences (1) in their entire, graduate, professional preparation including the internship, (2) in relation to university supervision during internship, and (3) in university course work; (4) their greatest felt strengths and problems as beginning teachers and the sources to which they attributed them; and (5) their perceptions of differences in attitude toward teaching as a career before and after the first year of teaching. The critical incident technique was used for formulating the leading questions and for categorizing the responses made during taped, open-end interviews with 24 elementary interns and 26 secondary interns. Each participant was in the first or second year of teaching experience after the year of intern teaching. Data were held separate for elementary interns from secondary and for men from women. The findings showed much diversity of opinions about effectiveness of experiences, not only between the elementary and secondary groups but within each group. No consistent differences could be associated with sex differences. Both groups identified early teaching experience itself as the most effective experience in their professional preparation, thus firmly supporting,

from the participants' point of view, the tenability of the internship pattern. Responses by elementary interns were characterized by emphasis upon the importance of idealism, feeling, and supportive relationships in the program and in the classrooms where they teach. The secondary group, in addition to these affective concerns, showed a distinctive emphasis upon the importance of stimulating teaching style and intellectual rigor of academic work for themselves in the university program and for their pupils in the classroom. Findings on strengths and weaknesses and their sources are rather similar to those in studies reported above, although differences were noted between the elementary and secondary groups. Attitude changes of interns after teaching experience were for both groups decidedly toward the more positive, even among those individuals who had entered the program doubtful or negative about teaching as a career. A theme of idealism and professional commitment was noted throughout the study among both the elementary and secondary interns. Rinehart concluded that the study, as well as providing an evaluation of the program by those who had experienced it, also developed a group portrait of the participating interns by providing insights into their values, aspirations, needs, and satisfactions.

SUMMARY

This review has organized reports about teacher intern programs and participants into two parts: explanatory and evaluative. Reports reviewed in the first part define distinguishing features of the intern pattern of teacher preparation, its status, and its historic development; the second part contains reports of research about the

effectiveness of interns as teachers and evaluations of the interns' problems and strengths with implications for improving intern programs for professional preparation of teachers.

The research findings to date have not presented evidence of the superiority of one kind of teacher preparation over another, either as measured by differences in teaching effectiveness of the graduates of the respective programs or by differences in the participants' perceptions of the values and weaknesses of their respective training programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Dwight W. "A New Design for Teacher Education: The Teacher Intern Program at Stanford University." Journal of Teacher Education 17:298-300; 1966.

Arends, Robert Lewis. A Comparative Study of the Graduates of the Michigan State University Elementary Intern Program and the Regular Teaching Education Program. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969. Or see Dissertation Abstracts 30:2395A-2396A.

Association for Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Internships in Teaching Education. Ed. Dorothy McGeoch. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1968.

Ballantine, Francis; Rowland, Monroe; and Wetherill, William. "Perceptions of Elementary School Teachers Trained at San Diego State College With Respect to the Value of Several Aspects of Their College Preparation." Journal of Teacher Education 17:218-223; 1966,(citing Popham and Greenberg).

Biddle, Bruce J. and Ellena, William J. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Blackmore, Dorothy S. "Integration of Theory and Practice in Internship." Internships in Teacher Education, Association For Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 41-63.

Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education. A Historical Survey of American Thought. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Broudy, Harry S. "Can We Define Good Teaching?" The Record 70: 583-592, April, 1969.

_____. "Criteria for the Professional Preparation of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education 16:408-415; 1965.

Brown, Iva D. and Brown, Fred W. "Variations on a Theme by Combs: The Professional Education of Teachers." Journal of Research and Development in Education 2:49-58, Fall, 1968.

Bulazo, George. Selected Supervisory Practices in the Secondary Department of the Graduate Teaching Internship Program at the University of Pittsburgh. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965.

Butterweck, Joseph S. "Whither Teacher Education?" Educational Administration and Supervision 43:33-43; 1955.

Conant, James. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Curti, Merle. The Social Ideas of American Educators. Patterson, N.J.: Littlefield, Adams, 1965.

Denemark, Geroge W. and MacDonald, James B. "Preservice and In-Service Education of Teachers." Review of Educational Research 37:233-247, June, 1967.

Gardner, Harrison. "The Teacher Education Internship in Historical Perspective." Internships in Teacher Education. Association For Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 1-15.

_____ and Henry, Marvin A. "Designing Effective Internships in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 19:177-186, Spring, 1968.

Goodlad, John I. "An Analysis of Professional Laboratory Experiences in the Education of Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 16:263-270; 1965.

Haberman, Martin. "The Teaching Behavior of Successful Interns." Journal of Teacher Education 16:215-220; 1965.

Halliwell, Joseph W. "A Review of the Research Comparing the Teaching Effectiveness of Elementary School Teachers Prepared in Intensive Teacher-Training Programs and in Regular Undergraduate Programs." Journal of Teacher Education 15:184-192, June, 1964.

Harap, Henry. "A Review of Recent Developments in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education 18:5-18, Spring, 1967.

_____. The Teaching Internship Program. U. S. Office of Education, Teacher Education Series 58004. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1961.

Hazard, William R.; Chandler, B.J.; and Stiles, Lindly J. "The Tutorial and Clinical Program for Teacher Education." Journal Of Teacher Education 18:269-276, Fall, 1967.

Hill, Russell A. and Medley, Donald M. "Change in Behaviors of First Year Intern Teachers. Paper presented at AERA Conference, February, 1968.

Hite, Herbert. Follow-Up Study: Long Term Effects of Modified Internship for Beginning Elementary Teachers. Seattle, Wash.: School Information and Research Service, 1967-'68, no. 11, June, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Hoffman, James D. "Changing Teaching Behavior: Objective of Internship." Internship in Teacher Education, Association For Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 65-75.

Indiana University School of Education Bulletin. "Insite - Partnership in Learning for Teacher Education." Bloomington, Indiana. Vol. 45, no. 3, May, 1969.

Johns Hopkins University. The M.A.T. Program. A Six-Year Report: 1957-'63. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University, [n.d.]

Johnson, James A. A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. Dekalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University, 1968. (Mimeographed.) P. 26.

_____. Innovations in Student Teaching. Supplement to the National Survey, published by Multi-State Teacher Education Project, Baltimore, Maryland, October, 1968.

Kershner, Robert Philip. A Comparative Study of the Teaching Competence of University of Oregon Interns and Convential Student Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1968. Or see Dissertation Abstracts 29:828A.

Kropp, Russell P. and Anderson, John E., Jr. "Teacher Roles Before and After Internship." Journal of Educational Research 56:366-9, March, 1963.

Livingston, Alfred. The Teaching Internship: The Identification and Analysis of Professional Problems of Intern Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Berkeley) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1962.

Michaelis, John U. "Teacher Education - Student Teaching and Internship." Encyclopedia of Educational Research (3rd. ed.). Chester W. Harris (Ed.). New York: Macmillan, 1960. Pp. 1473-1481.

Miller, H. Bernard. An Analysis of Empirically Selected Components of Pressure, Difficulty, and Satisfaction Reported by Beginning Secondary School Intern Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1970.)

Moore, Samuel A. II. "Who Expects What From the Internship?" Journal of Teacher Education 18:279-81, Fall, 1967.

Moss, Robert H. "Reactions of Interns to Programs." Internships in Teacher Education, Association For Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 189-198.

Rex, Ronald G. "A Conceptual Model of the Internship in Professional Training." Internships in Teacher Education, Association for Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 17-28.

_____. A Theory of the Internship in Professional Training. (Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1961.

Rinehart, Alice Duffy. Critical Experiences of Initiation into Teaching through a Graduate School Teacher Intern Program for Elementary and Secondary Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969. Or see Dissertation Abstracts 30:5238A, June, 1970.

Ryan, Kevin. "The Teaching Intern: A Sociological Stranger." Journal of Teacher Education 17:185-191; 1966.

Schloerke, Wallace C. and Czajkowski, Theodore. "Intern Survey - 1967," Internships in Teacher Education, Association For Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 161-170

Shaplin, Judson T. "Practice in Teaching." Reprinted in Breakthroughs To Better Teaching. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Educational Review, pp. 23-47, [n.d.]. First appeared in Harvard Educational Review, Vo. 31, No. 1, Winter, 1961.

_____ and Powell, Arthur G. "A Comparison of Internship Programs." Journal of Teacher Education 15:175-183, June, 1964.

Shawver, David. "Professional Education or Apprenticeship?" The Record 70:127-131, November, 1968.

Sorber, Evan R. Classroom Interaction Patterns and Personality Needs of Traditionally Prepared First-Year Elementary Teachers and Graduate Teaching Interns With Degrees from Colleges of Liberal Arts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1964.

Stevens, Elmer S. A Status Study of Internship Programs in Teacher Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 1956.

Stone, James C. and Robinson, Clark N. The Graduate Internship Program in Teacher Education. The First Six Years. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1965.

Stoops, John A. The Education of the Inner Man. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1969.

Temple University. Evaluation: Intern Teaching Program. Philadelphia: Intern Teaching Program, Graduate School of Education, 1965. 4 pp.

_____. Report on Intern Teaching Program. Philadelphia, 1967. 42 pp.

University of Pittsburgh School of Education. Teaching Internships for Liberal Arts and Education Graduates. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, Office of Graduate Study, [n.d.].

Ward, Ted W. "Developing Teacher Behavior in Clinical Settings." Internships in Teacher Education. Association for Student Teaching, 47th Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1968. Pp. 145-158.

Ward, William and Suttle, John. "The Oregon Plan to Improve the Induction Process," Journal of Teacher Education 17:444-451; 1966.

Whitelaw, John B. The Potentialities of the Paid Teaching Internship. Report of Six Regional Seminars. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Gov't. Printing Office, 1965.

Wieder, Charles F. A Comparison of the Classroom Verbal Interaction Patterns of Intermediate Grade Student Teachers and Intermediate Grade Intern Teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1967.

Woodring, Paul. A Fourth of a Nation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Wulk, Jerry and Miller, Ralph. "A New Experience at U.C.L.A.: Secondary Teaching Internships." Journal of Teacher Education 16:300-302; 1965.